

Manufacturer/producer/exporter	Weighted-average margin percentage
Tubos Acero de Mexico, S.A. ...	23.79
All Others	23.79

International Trade Commission (ITC) Notification

In accordance with section 735(d) of the Act, we have notified the ITC of our determination. The ITC will make its determination whether these imports materially injure, or threaten injury to, a U.S. industry within 75 days of the publication of this notice, in accordance with section 735(b)(3) of the Act. If the ITC determines that material injury or threat of material injury does not exist, the proceeding will be terminated and all securities posted as a result of the suspension of liquidation will be refunded or cancelled. However, if the ITC determines that material injury or threat of material injury does exist, the Department will issue an antidumping duty order.

Notification to Interested Parties

This notice serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) in this investigation of their responsibility covering the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(d). Failure to comply is a violation of the APO.

This determination is published pursuant to section 735(d) of the Act and 19 CFR 353.20(a)(4).

Dated: June 19, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,
Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95-15621 Filed 6-27-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

[A-469-806]

Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Oil Country Tubular Goods from Spain

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 28, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Magd Zalok or William Crow, Office of Antidumping Investigations, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-4162 or 482-0116, respectively.

Final Determination

We determine that oil country tubular goods (OCTG) from Spain are being sold in the United States at less than fair value, as provided in section 735 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"). The estimated margins are shown in the "Suspension of Liquidation" section of this notice.

Case History

Since the preliminary determination of sales at less than fair value in this investigation on January 26, 1995 (60 FR 6516, February 2, 1995), the following events have occurred. On February 8, 1995, (60 FR 8632, February 15, 1995) the Department postponed the final determination in accordance with section 735(a)(2) of the Act and 19 CFR 353.20(b)(1).

In March 1995, the Department conducted its sales and cost verifications of the respondent, Tubos Reunidos ("TR") in Spain. Verification reports were issued in April and May 1995.

On May 9, 1995, the petitioners and TR submitted case briefs. Rebuttal briefs were submitted by both parties on May 16, 1995. On May 17, 1995, the Department held a public hearing.

Scope of the Investigation

For purposes of this investigation, OCTG are hollow steel products of circular cross-section, including oil well casing, tubing, and drill pipe, of iron (other than cast iron) or steel (both carbon and alloy), whether seamless or welded, whether or not conforming to American Petroleum Institute (API) or non-API specifications, whether finished or unfinished (including green tubes and limited service OCTG products). This scope does not cover casing, tubing, or drill pipe containing 10.5 percent or more of chromium. The OCTG subject to this investigation are currently classified in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) under item numbers:

7304.20.10.10, 7304.20.10.20, 7304.20.10.30, 7304.20.10.40, 7304.20.10.50, 7304.20.10.60, 7304.20.10.80, 7304.20.20.10, 7304.20.20.20, 7304.20.20.30, 7304.20.20.40, 7304.20.20.50, 7304.20.20.60, 7304.20.20.80, 7304.20.30.10, 7304.20.30.20, 7304.20.30.30, 7304.20.30.40, 7304.20.30.50, 7304.20.30.60, 7304.20.30.80, 7304.20.40.10, 7304.20.40.20, 7304.20.40.30, 7304.20.40.40, 7304.20.40.50, 7304.20.40.60, 7304.20.40.80, 7304.20.50.15, 7304.20.50.30, 7304.20.50.45, 7304.20.50.60,

7304.20.50.75, 7304.20.60.15, 7304.20.60.30, 7304.20.60.45, 7304.20.60.60, 7304.20.60.75, 7304.20.70.00, 7304.20.80.30, 7304.20.80.45, 7304.20.80.60, 7305.20.20.00, 7305.20.40.00, 7305.20.60.00, 7305.20.80.00, 7306.20.10.30, 7306.20.10.90, 7306.20.20.00, 7306.20.30.00, 7306.20.40.00, 7306.20.60.10, 7306.20.60.50, 7306.20.80.10, and 7306.20.80.50.

After the publication of the preliminary determination, we found that HTSUS item numbers 7304.20.10.00, 7304.20.20.00, 7304.20.30.00, 7304.20.40.00, 7304.20.50.10, 7304.20.50.50, 7304.20.60.10, 7304.20.60.50, and 7304.20.80.00 were no longer valid HTSUS item numbers. Accordingly, these numbers have been deleted from the scope definition.

Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this investigation is dispositive.

Period of Investigation

The period of investigation (POI) is January 1, 1994, through June 30, 1994.

Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Statute and to the Department's regulations are in reference to the provisions as they existed on December 31, 1994.

Best Information Available (BIA)

We have determined that TR's questionnaire responses provide an inadequate basis for estimating dumping margins. At verification, we discovered significant omissions, discrepancies, and a large number of errors in TR's responses, as well as an overall lack of support for certain of TR's sales data. Instead of reporting the actual prices charged to the first unrelated U.S. customers, as requested by the Department, TR incorrectly reported the U.S. prices invoiced to its related subsidiary, and failed to provide adequate support documentation at verification for the actual prices invoiced to the U.S. customers. TR omitted reporting all charges in the U.S. market for freight, guarantee and return credits and did not provide adequate support documentation at verification for these charges. TR also omitted reporting the sale of certain OCTG products, and provided no evidence at verification that the sales of these products were not covered by the scope of this investigation. In its responses, TR stated that its home market was not viable with respect to the sale of the

subject merchandise. However, the sales of certain OCTG products discovered at verification indicate a viable home market, thereby making the use of a third country market, instead of the home market as a basis for determining foreign market value, questionable. Finally, in addition to the significant omissions, the charges and adjustments reported by TR were replete with discrepancies and errors, making it impossible for the Department to conduct a complete verification of TR's responses.

In order to determine whether sales are made in the United States at less than fair value, it is critical that the Department be provided with accurate and reliable sales information to be used in its analysis. Because of the inaccuracies discovered in TR's submitted information, the Department was unable to verify that information, as required by section 776(1) of the Act. That section of the Act provides that, if the Department is unable to verify, within the time specified, the accuracy and completeness of the factual information submitted, it shall use BIA as the basis for its determination. Consequently, we have based this determination on BIA.

In determining what rate to use as BIA, the Department follows a two-tiered BIA methodology, whereby the Department may impose the most adverse rate upon those respondents who refuse to cooperate or otherwise impede the proceeding, or assign a lower rate for those respondents who have cooperated in an investigation. When a company is determined to be uncooperative, it has been the Department's practice to apply the highest rate alleged in the petition as BIA. When a company is determined to be cooperative, it has been the Department's practice to apply as BIA the higher of: (1) The average of the margins in the petition; or (2) the calculated margin for another firm for the same class or kind of merchandise from the same country. This methodology for assigning BIA has been upheld by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. (See *Allied-Signal Aerospace Co. v. the United States*, Slip Op. 93-1049 (Fed Cir. June 22, 1993); see also *Krupp Stahl AG. et al v. the United States*, Slip Op. 93-84 (CIT May 26, 1993).)

In spite of the numerous errors in its response, we have determined that TR was cooperative during this proceeding and have assigned to it a cooperative BIA margin of 11.95 percent, based on the average of the margins alleged in the petition. For further information on the

use of a cooperative BIA margin, see the "DOC Position" section of this notice.

Verification

As provided in section 776(b) of the Act, we attempted to verify TR's information for purposes of the final determination. However, given the significant discrepancies encountered at verification, the use of the respondent's information in the final determination was not possible.

Interested Party Comments

Comment 1—Use of Total Uncooperative BIA

The petitioners maintain that because of the gravity of the mistakes made by TR, the Department should assign to TR an uncooperative BIA margin of 18.6 percent. They point to the verification report which shows that TR failed to report the actual price as invoiced to the first unrelated U.S. customer, and note that many other discrepancies and omissions were found by the Department at verification.

TR maintains that the record clearly reflects that it has cooperated fully with the Department in this investigation, submitting hundreds of pages of responses to the Department questionnaires and supplemental questionnaires within the time allowed. According to the respondent, due to the tight time constraints of antidumping investigations, a number of errors have been made, many of which came to light in preparing documentation for verification. TR maintains that it promptly and fully disclosed the errors to the Department as soon as the respondent became aware of such errors.

Moreover, TR contends that only following receipt of the verification outline on March 7, 1995, did TR's officials, in the course of preparing the payment documentation for verification, see the need to refer to the actual invoices re-issued by TR America, inclusive of the inland freight. TR maintains that, even if it had realized the need earlier to report to the Department the actual invoiced prices inclusive of the U.S. inland freight expenses, it would not have changed the way in which the sales listing was ultimately prepared. TR states that, in order to be able to provide a timely response to the Department's questionnaire, it was necessary to report sales data as it was reflected in TR's computer in Spain. Furthermore, TR argues that it was appropriate not to report sales of class "C" OCTG and couplings stock because these products are not covered in the scope of the

investigation. Finally, TR claims that the errors and discrepancies discovered for the remaining sales data are insignificant and offset each other. Therefore, the respondent requests that the Department use the information gathered at verification as a basis for TR's margin calculation in the final determination.

DOC Position

As discussed in the BIA section of this notice, the discrepancies found in TR's response render it unusable. The Department, however, disagrees with the petitioners on assigning TR a non-cooperative BIA margin. Although much of the information found to be deficient could not be remedied at verification, TR made a good faith effort by responding to the Department's questionnaire, by submitting a verifiable cost of production questionnaire response, and by attempting to cooperate at the sales verification. We also believe that the inaccuracy of TR's responses is the result of inadvertent errors in its reporting, and poor verification preparation, not a lack of cooperation on the part of the respondent. Thus, we believe that assigning TR a cooperative BIA margin is appropriate.

Because this final determination is based on BIA, all other comments are moot.

Suspension of Liquidation

Pursuant to the results of this final determination, we will instruct the Customs Service to require a cash deposit or posting of a bond equal to the estimated final dumping margin, as shown below for entries of OCTG from Spain that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption from the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. The suspension of liquidation will remain in effect until further notice.

Producer/manufacturer/exporter	Margin percentage
Tubos Reunidos S.A	11.95
All Others	11.95

ITC Notification

In accordance with section 735(d) of the Act, we have notified the ITC of our determination. The ITC will make its determination whether these imports materially injure, or threaten injury to, a U.S. industry within 75 days of the publication of this notice, in accordance with section 735(b)(3) of the Act. If the ITC determines that material injury or threat of material injury does not exist,

the proceeding will be terminated and all securities posted as a result of the suspension of liquidation will be refunded or canceled. However, if the ITC determines that such injury does exist, the Department will issue an antidumping duty order.

Notification to Interested Parties

This notice serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) in this investigation of their responsibility covering the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(d). Failure to comply is a violation of the APO.

This determination is published pursuant to section 735(d) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1673(d)) and 19 CFR 353.20.

Dated: June 19, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95-15622 Filed 6-27-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

[C-475-817]

Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination: Oil Country Tubular Goods ("OCTG") From Italy

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 28, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Peter Wilkniss, Office of Countervailing Investigations, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 3099, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-0588.

Final Determination

The Department determines that benefits which constitute subsidies within the meaning of section 701 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"), are being provided to manufacturers, producers, or exporters in Italy of OCTG. For information on the estimated net subsidies, please see the *Suspension of Liquidation* section of this notice.

Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute and to the Department's regulations are references to the provisions as they existed on December 31, 1994. References to the Countervailing Duties: Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Request for Public Comments, 54 FR 23366 (May 31, 1989) (Proposed Regulations), which

has been withdrawn, are provided solely for further explanation of the Department's CVD practice.

Case History

Since the publication of the preliminary determination in the **Federal Register** (59 FR 61870, December 2, 1994), the following events have occurred.

On December 23, 1994, we aligned the final countervailing duty determination in this investigation with the final determination in the companion antidumping investigation of OCTG from Italy (59 FR 66295).

We conducted verification of the responses submitted on behalf of the Government of Italy ("GOI"), and Dalmine S.p.A. ("Dalmine") from January 22 through January 27, 1995.

On April 19, 1995, we postponed the final determination in this case to June 19, 1995 (60 FR 19571).

On May 2, 1995 we received a case brief from respondent. Neither petitioner nor respondent requested a hearing in this investigation.

Scope of Investigation

For purposes of this investigation, OCTG are hollow steel products of circular cross-section, including oil well casing, tubing, and drill pipe, of iron (other than cast iron) or steel (both carbon and alloy), whether seamless or welded, whether or not conforming to American Petroleum Institute (API) or non-API specifications, whether finished or unfinished (including green tubes and limited service OCTG products). This scope does not cover casing, tubing, or drill pipe containing 10.5 percent or more of chromium. The OCTG subject to this investigation are currently classified in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) under item numbers:

7304.20.10.10, 7304.20.10.20, 7304.20.10.30, 7304.20.10.40, 7304.20.10.50, 7304.20.10.60, 7304.20.10.80, 7304.20.20.10, 7304.20.20.20, 7304.20.20.30, 7304.20.20.40, 7304.20.20.50, 7304.20.20.60, 7304.20.20.80, 7304.20.30.10, 7304.20.30.20, 7304.20.30.30, 7304.20.30.40, 7304.20.30.50, 7304.20.30.60, 7304.20.30.80, 7304.20.40.10, 7304.20.40.20, 7304.20.40.30, 7304.20.40.40, 7304.20.40.50, 7304.20.40.60, 7304.20.40.80, 7304.20.50.15, 7304.20.50.30, 7304.20.50.45, 7304.20.50.60, 7304.20.50.75, 7304.20.60.15, 7304.20.60.30, 7304.20.60.45, 7304.20.60.60, 7304.20.60.75, 7304.20.70.00, 7304.20.80.30, 7304.20.80.45, 7304.20.80.60,

7305.20.20.00, 7305.20.40.00, 7305.20.60.00, 7305.20.80.00, 7306.20.10.30, 7306.20.10.90, 7306.20.20.00, 7306.20.30.00, 7306.20.40.00, 7306.20.60.10, 7306.20.60.50, 7306.20.80.10, and 7306.20.80.50.

After the publication of the preliminary determination, we found that HTSUS item numbers 7304.20.10.00, 7304.20.20.00, 7304.20.30.00, 7304.20.40.00, 7304.20.50.10, 7304.20.50.50, 7304.20.60.10, 7304.20.60.50, and 7304.20.80.00 were no longer valid HTSUS item numbers. Accordingly, these numbers have been deleted from the scope definition.

Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this investigation is dispositive.

Injury Test

Because Italy is a "country under the Agreement" within the meaning of section 701(b) of the Act, the U.S. International Trade Commission ("ITC") is required to determine whether imports of OCTG from Italy materially injure, or threaten material injury to, a U.S. industry. On August 3, 1994, the ITC preliminarily determined that there is a reasonable indication that an industry in the United States is being materially injured or threatened with material injury by reason of imports from Italy of the subject merchandise (59 FR 42286, August 17, 1994).

Corporate History of Respondent Dalmine

Prior to its liquidation in 1988, Finsider S.p.A. ("Finsider") was the holding company for all state-owned steel companies in Italy, including Dalmine. Dalmine was an operating company wholly owned by Finsider. After Finsider's liquidation, a new government-owned holding company, ILVA S.p.A. ("ILVA"), was created. ILVA took over the former Finsider companies, among them Dalmine, which became a subsidiary of ILVA in 1989 when Finsider's shareholding in Dalmine was transferred to ILVA.

Between 1990 and 1993, Dalmine itself was radically restructured. Dalmine became a financial holding company, with industrial, trading, and service shareholdings. As part of its restructuring, Dalmine made several asset purchases, sold two of its subsidiaries to private parties, and closed several manufacturing facilities. As of December 31, 1993, the Dalmine Group consisted of a holding company (Dalmine S.p.A.), four wholly-owned, and one majority-owned, manufacturing